

Identity

The background of the cover is a map of Britain with various Roman names like 'Lancashire', 'Shropshire', 'Lincoln', and 'Cardigan Bay' visible. Overlaid on the map is a large, golden statue of Emperor Nero, pointing his right hand towards the top left. In the foreground, there is a golden statue of a horse and rider, likely representing Boudicca, in a dynamic, rearing pose.

Magazine of the British National Party

October 2008 - Issue 95 - £2.40

This Month

The effects of multi-national corporations on Britain

How British politics ended up this way

Boudicca - Britain in Revolt

Eddy Butler on Boudicca's stand against the Roman invasion

News

BNP Storms UKIP Stronghold

In the recent past Rotherham has been one of the better electoral areas for UKIP, and particularly Wickersley Ward where this May they polled 879 votes. In late August, contesting the ward for the first time, the BNP came from nowhere in a by-election to beat UKIP with 20% of the poll. Result: Lab 871, Con 824, BNP 538, UKIP 373, Lib-Dem 191.

No wonder that UKIP is receiving comments such as this made by Finland's foreign minister, Alexander Stubb, in an interview with the *Irish Times*, 01.09.08 on the effectiveness of UKIP in the European Parliament: "The party has become a complete footnote with no influence".

EU Erodes Liberties at 'Breathtaking Rate'

The civil liberties watchdog Statewatch said last month that our civil liberties are being eroded at a "breathtaking" rate by EU governments. It criticised the EU's security strategy as a "frightening" grab for every aspect of individual information. It added that the EU now saw data privacy and judicial scrutiny of police surveillance tactics as obstacles to efficient law enforcement co-operation, rather than rights to be safeguarded.

More IT Jobs Go East

So many lower-level IT jobs are going to India and China that it is causing a skills gap in Britain, with companies providing fewer graduate opportunities. The result is that IT graduate numbers are dwindling and mid-level pay rates are rising because of a growing acute skills shortage. Yet these are the very jobs that the Lib-Lab-Con said would be increased as globalism closed most of our manufacturing industry.

British Workers' Choice: Heat or Eat

The Government's refusal to levy a windfall tax on cash rich energy companies has been condemned by the autonomous Trade Union, Solidarity.

President Adam Walker said: "The rise in basic prices whether foodstuffs, fuel or



energy is not being covered by meagre pay rises. Consequently as belts are pulled tighter many low paid British workers will be faced with a difficult choice this winter: do they heat or eat?"

One way the Chancellor could have helped these workers and also pensioners would have been to levy a windfall tax on energy companies, whether oil or utilities. Adam Walker added: "The vast profits some of these conglomerates have amassed on the back of inflated prices are obscene. The fact that the Government has failed to direct some of that profit back to the most needy makes a mockery of the supposed values of the Labour Government and their supporters amongst some of the traditional Trade Unions. This Government is clearly out of touch with its roots and will ultimately pay the price at the ballot box."

Immigrant Brings in Untreatable TB

An asylum seeker from Somalia is seriously ill in a Leeds hospital with a strain of virtually untreatable tuberculosis. He is the first to be diagnosed in Britain with extreme drug-resistant XDR TB. It remains unclear if his application for asylum, when he arrived here last year, has been successful but the bill for treatment will run into tens of thousands of pounds a year.

Census a "Waste of Money"

The 2011 census should be abandoned because it will waste hundreds of millions of pounds and fail to take account of hundreds of thousands of immigrants. This is the view of a pro-Gordon Brown think-tank, New Local Government Network.

The NLGN report says poor quality information on households, high rates of population mobility and a growing reluctance to fill in official forms will mean the census will not accurately reflect the true state of Britain.

Identity says that the same could be said

of the fictitious figures of the 2001 census which have been used to pretend that immigration has been lower than it really is.

Footballer in Race Row

Sergei Rebrov, Ukrainian international and former Tottenham player, has been accused of provoking a racism row by offering advice to new Tottenham signing, Roman Pavlyuchenko. According to the *Daily Telegraph* Sports Section, 10.09.08, Rebrov said that many of the residents living near White Hart Lane, Tottenham, "were dark skinned and there was a lot of crime as a result". He advised Pavlyuchenko to avoid walking around the area close to Tottenham's ground unless he wanted to be a "robbery victim".

Excess Foreign Students Lower Degree System

The degree system in Britain is "rotten" with grades based on "arbitrary and unreliable" measures, according to the universities watchdog the Quality Assurance Agency. It warned that the influx of overseas students, who are encouraged because they pay higher fees, was pushing standards down as the students expected their fees to gain them a degree automatically.

It should be noted that Liam Byrne, the immigration minister, recently announced that foreign students will be able to work in Britain for an extra year before being sent home. Yet already students are by far the biggest category for long-term visitors to Britain, with 1.6 million visas handed out in the past five years. In 2006, 309,000 foreign "students" arrived here, up nine per cent in a year.

identity

Editor: John Bean
Design: Mark Collett
October 2008

Public reference:
ISSN 1469-7971

Subscriptions Dept:
PO Box 17, Amlwch,
LL68 8AB

Tel: 0871 050 0238

subscriptions@bnp.org.uk

www.identitymagazine.org.uk

Articles should be submitted to the

addresses below in

typed/electronic format:

PO Box 97, Newmarket,

Suffolk CB8 1WT.

Email: identity@bnp.org.uk



Signs Of Immigrant Arrogance

We will make no apologies for returning to the subject of immigration, even if our opponents say that the British National Party is but a one trick pony capitalising on the British public's growing concern with this issue. The impetus to do so this month is a response to the arrogance now being shown by the National Black Police Association who are threatening to bring in members from all over the country to march in London and at the same time urging ethnic minorities to boycott the Metropolitan police. What the 90% of white policemen and women think of this action we are not told, because there is no National White Police Association - such a body would be considered as "racist".

It seems that the capital city of a once great empire is going down the same route as Rome in the 2nd century AD when its Praetorian Guard - and its once mighty legions reflected the new make-up of Rome: the peoples from the colonies ("each bringing their own customs and practices", as Gibbons described it in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*) had virtually replaced the original patrician stock and crime, revolt, disease and the domination of usury was now commonplace.

The impending revolt of this sector of London's latter day Praetorian Guard is mainly down to the actions of some senior Muslim officers who have decided to sue the Metropolitan Police, and ironically the ultra politically correct PC, Commissioner Sir Ian Blair for racial discrimination. Heading this action is the high ranking Assistant Commissioner Tarique Ghaffur, who has already won some earlier 'discrimination' charges as well as showing that he is really a genius the Met and the Home Office has failed to recognise and should really be running the show in place of Blair. He also alleges that Blair conspired with senior Home Office officials to strip him of responsibilities and sideline him.

The Met's head of diversity, Yasmin Rehman, is also suing the force for racial discrimination. A third senior Muslim officer, Shabir Hussain, recently lost a case after claiming he had been sidelined because of his race and turned down for promotion four times.

Churning Population Hits 61m

This arrogance being shown by some sectors of the immigrant community is an outcome of Britain's make-up now being changed at an unprecedented rate, with more than one million people either settling here or leaving last year. According to the Office for National Statistics (ONS) there is an unprecedented "churn" in the population caused by large scale immigration and emigration. Last year 605,000 entered Britain and 200,000 Britons left. Add to this the sharp rise in births, nearly half from immigrant or immigrant-

descended mothers, we achieve a new population high of 61 million, with the percentage of non-British stock rising exponentially.

In some towns and cities more than half of babies had mothers born overseas (let alone mothers born here of non-European stock). They included London with 54%, Slough 56%, Luton 51%, and Leicester with 44%. In the London borough of Newham the figure was 75%.

The ONS figures only cover the year up to mid-2007. Separate figures released this August by the Department of Work and Pensions show that in the 2007-08 financial year, 733,000 National Insurance numbers were allocated to adult overseas national entering the country.

A great fanfare was accorded to a patently fake "cross party parliamentary group on immigration" who came up with the useless idea of a "one in, one out" policy. In other words replace Britons leaving the sinking ship with Afro-Asian immigrants. European immigrants could not be curtailed because of our EU membership. Although chaired by former Labour and Tory ministers, Frank Field and Nicholas Soames, the Government took less than 24 hours to reject it and told us that its points system was all that was needed to "control" immigration.

This so-called control will do nothing about the backlog of 660,000 applications for asylum. According to a *News of the World* report there are only 60 Immigration Service officials trying to review this backlog. As they have "become embedded in British society" they will be given an effective secret amnesty by the government.

There is no indication whatsoever that this country's official opposition, the Conservative Party, is prepared to take any effective steps to stop the colonisation of Britain and the eventual elimination of its people who created its culture. Outside of the ranks of the BNP the only person talking sense on this most important of all issues is Sir Andrew Green, Chairman of Migration Watch UK. Last month he said: "More immigrants settling in Britain is the last thing we need. Our population is already increasing by a third of a million every year, mainly due to immigration. We will have to build the equivalent of the city of Birmingham every three years just to cope."

However, Sir Andrew does not represent a political movement. Therefore, our survival depends on the success of the BNP. And as far as I am concerned it must remain under the leadership of Nick Griffin because he does not confuse the issue by talking of Britain (as some would do) as a geographical concept but as the product of our racial forbears. And he and his lieutenants have shown that this can be done without directing hatred or abuse towards other races.

John Bean



One For & One Against

» "There is nothing new under the sun." The well known phrase only hints at the value of the study of past events for guidelines as to how to learn from the mistakes - and the successes - of others. Nick Griffin gives two examples of this, first exploring a lost lesson from one of the most important moments of British history for precedents for the radicalism of a future nationalist government, and second explaining how our opponents are applying their own lessons from the past to try to stop us getting to that point.

One of the most effective ways to advance any political or military struggle is to study the successes and failures of others. Such indirect experience is far easier, cheaper and less painful to acquire than doing it yourself. This is one reason why the liberal-left's deliberate policy of hacking away our cultural and historical roots is so dangerous.

It's not just that "if you don't know where you've come from, you can't work out where you're going". Ignorance of how we got to where we are today dooms our people to repeat many of the mistakes made along the way of which the statesmen of wiser eras would have been well aware.

Young nationalists in particular, brought up in a time when computer games have all but replaced the serious reading that previous generations took for granted, may need a little convincing of the value of a careful study of the past for those who would change the future. Two examples of what can be learned from the past may help to make the point:

The first is of particular interest to anyone planning a political, economic and social revolution in Britain. At first glance, it would seem that Britain has little to offer the student or would-be practitioner of revolutionary change - the brief and rapidly reversed republican experiment under Oliver Cromwell, and the closely connected constitutional settlement of the Glorious Revolution of 1689 appearing at first sight to pale into insignificance compared with continental revolutions such as in France and Russia.

In fact, of course, the establishment of a constitutional monarchy in 1689 was an event of enormous long-term political significance, albeit one now heavily

downplayed by the liberal elite as it sits very uneasily with core parts of their own Project, particularly ever-closer European Union. But when it comes to drastic and permanent social and economic upheaval, a casual student of history is all too likely to think that "the British don't do that sort of thing".

Wrong! Far from being sedate and innately conservative, our island story at the very start of modern times is in large measure based on probably the largest, most radical and most permanent transfer of land, property and power in European history: the Dissolution of the Monasteries by Henry VIII.

To say this is not to take sides in the ancient conflict between Protestantism and Catholicism, and has no bearing on the fact that the Distributism that underpin much of the BNP's thinking on economic and social matters has its roots largely in Catholic Social Doctrine. It is merely to point out a fact of history - the assault on the monastic system in England, Wales and Ireland was a revolution carried out with extraordinary swiftness and never reversed.

At the start of 1536, more than 16% of the whole of England was owned by the clerical institutions collectively known as 'the Monasteries'. By 1541, the seizure and sale of a staggering two million acres had transferred the ownership, wealth and power of every last one of those acres to the Crown, sections of the landed aristocracy, and large numbers of up-and-coming merchants. In just five years a set of institutions which had wielded enormous social, economic, legal and spiritual influence for generations were wiped out with no trace except for some picturesque ruins.

It is true that there were minor precedents for this upheaval: Edward I had sequestered the assets of what were known as 'Alien Priorities' at the end of the thirteenth centuries, and Henry V had taken over another batch of foreign-owned monasteries in 1414, but the scale of the change overseen by Henry VIII and Thomas Cromwell was vast.

So too was popular resistance to this huge land-grab. The peasantry of the entire North and much of the South West rose in bloodily-suppressed revolt; the brutal execution of the Abbots of Colchester, Glastonbury and Reading created potential martyrs as well as intimidating potential resisters; support for the old religion remained immensely strong at all levels of society; the loss of the 5% of all net monastic income which had been given as alms to the poor and to travellers was bitterly resented by the 'lower orders'.

When Henry's son Edward died after just a few years of even more fundamentalist Protestant rule, it seemed likely that the new, Catholic Queen Mary would slam the whole process into reverse gear. That she failed was in part due to the grass-roots strength of Protestantism, and to the ease with which the opponents of her attempted counter-revolution were able to link it and her with the threat of foreign tyranny.

But more important than ideology, sentiment and propaganda was the way in which Henry's land-grab had so enriched such a large number of aristocrats and nouveau riche merchants that they formed a dominant block within society with massive personal vested interest in maintaining the new status quo. Even Mary's Catholic lay supporters, for all their doctrinal enthusiasm for a restoration of the old ways, resolutely refused to hand over a scrap of the confiscated monastic wealth which they had bought from the Crown under her father.

Similarly, even staunchly Catholic Lay Lords saw moves to restore the 'Mitred Abbeys' as something that would diminish their own power in Parliament, and obstructed moves to recreate the shattered power of the monastic orders. So Mary died an embittered, hated, failure, and her sister Elizabeth ushered in a period of relative religious toleration and of a new social order based on the changed power relations created by the transferred ownership of so much land and wealth.

With so many vested interests in favour of keeping the new status quo, the huge initial popular sympathy for the old order was not translated into effective political pressure. As a result it withered away. While the issues between Protestantism and Catholicism were to remain live and central to national politics for more than two hundred years, the prospect of reversing the destruction of the monasteries was dead and buried in a tenth of that time.

What are we to take from this? Well, let us first consider our mission. The task to which we are called is the saving of our land, traditions and people from a multi-headed hydra of lethal threats, most of them deliberately created by the convergence of various powerful groups' 'Projects' (the Frankfurt School's assault on Western culture, the artificial globalisation of the economy at the behest of multinational capitalism, and the Europhile scheme for the destruction of the nation state, to name but three).

The wickedly destructive cancers which such forces have let loose in our nation are all too well advanced and deep-rooted. The surgery required to cut them out, and the healing process needed to restore the patient to health cannot possibly be carried out in less than three full terms in national government.

Take dealing with the threat from the federal Europe as an example: While the tearing up of the Treaty of Rome and its successors would be achieved by 11am of our first morning in power, it would take at least a decade to see through the job of rebuilding our national energy independence and undo the economic interdependence which has been deliberately imposed in an attempt to prevent our recovering our freedom.

Merely coming to power is not enough, the full counter-revolution that can alone restore our liberty and our children's future demands that we stay in power for longer than is normal in the democratic political system to which we are committed. In this respect, the revolution wrought by Henry VIII teaches two invaluable lessons.

First, that those who maintain that radical and sudden change is alien to the psychology of our people, something that is only done by excitable foreigners, are wholly wrong. Revolutions where the rabble wade knee-deep in blood certainly do not have a precedent in Britain but, as already noted, the radical and irreversible redistribution of the wealth of institutions whose time has past was virtually invented in England, and has rarely, if ever been outdone elsewhere.

Second, that giving Little Jack Horner the deeds to one of the monasteries he seized for the Crown (the juicy 'plum' of nursery rhyme fame) turned him and his fellow beneficiaries into such staunch supporters of the new dispensation that it became unassailable.

So where will we find plums? Well, just at present one naturally thinks in terms of the real life assets waiting to be picked from the wreckage of the greed-driven suicide of finance capitalism.

There are also the assets of the former public services which have been looted courtesy of the hyper-free trade let loose by the nineteenth century liberal Margaret Thatcher and the rules of the EU and World Trade Organisation. Just because this



wholesale theft of our Common Wealth was approved by several gangs of parliamentary crooks does not make it any less wrong, and where our people have been wronged it is our job to put things right.

By the time the looming wave of Islamic and Far Eastern sovereign wealth fund fire-sale acquisition of the last attractive bits of our ruined economy is complete, there will be untold billions of pounds-worth of assets in the grasping hands of our civilisational enemies or competitors. Virtually all those concerned expropriated and redistributed the assets of European economic colonialism halfway through the last century. What goes around comes around.

Finally (though the inventive could probably add to the list) there are our home-grown monopolies, the giant supermarkets for example. These have used every dirty trick in the book to drive their smaller competitors to the wall, to bribe and bully their way in to communities that were far better off without them, have nailed suppliers to the floor and taken consumers for a ride, and have played a major role in leaving this country almost uniquely exposed to the coming Energy Crunch - globalised at a time when localism is the key to transition and survival.

By these crimes and wrongs mean their owners and directors have forfeited their usual property rights (though those of small investors and pensioners, naturally, must be protected). Converted by due legal process into John Lewis/Waitrose style workers' co-operatives, they would allow a nationalist government to give hundreds of thousands of voters, and their families, a direct stake in the nationalist counter-revolution. Happily, such moves would also go a long way to restoring the institution of widely distributed private property as a counter to the servile state on the one hand and the proletarianisation of the masses driven by monopoly capitalism on the other.

This reconstruction of a genuinely mixed economy, in which the most effective form of private enterprise - personal and family business ownership - plays a key role, has been the goal of radical traditionalists like us for decades. The ideal can be traced as far back as William Cobbett, though it thrived most at the time of the last great crisis of capitalism courtesy of ahead-of-their-time theorists such as G. K. Chesterton and Arthur Pentty, and was revived more recently by Schumacher's *Small Is Beautiful*.

Now we are due for a further revival - and implementation - of nationalist alternatives to centralisation, monopoly and foreign absentee ownership. The current turmoil in the financial markets, and the pain this will inflict on millions of ordinary workers, tax-payers and savers, provide irrefutable evidence of the need for, and the right, of an elected nationalist government to regulate to curb the short-termism and

greed which are the flip-side of capitalism's productivity and inventiveness.

In the final analysis, perpetual growth in a finite world is an impossibility, hence for nationalism to assert the right to set limits on capitalism is not some strange 'socialist' throwback or impractical idealism, but a proper and necessary exercise of governmental power on behalf of present and future generations alike.

It is an added bonus that, handled properly, such necessary economic and social radicalism can also provide a 21st century equivalent of the monastic wealth which tied a defining proportion of the people who made things tick in sixteenth century England to the Tudor revolution.

LEARNING FROM HISTORY

All of which, however, is contingent on us coming to power in the first place. Which brings us to the second example of learning from history, this time one which has been learned by our opponents. It is worth knowing about, not because it is something that we might want to use, but because to understand their game is to beat it.

It goes back a few years to a small conference held by the criminal Stalinist organisation *Searchlight* to examine ways to counter the growing use of the Internet by nationalists, and to harness the new information technology for their own twisted cause.

Gerry Gable and the rest of the

Searchlight gang are unimaginatively fixated on the 'great anti-fascist struggle' of the first half of the last century. Sometimes this surfaces when bemused householders in our target wards find themselves scratching their heads over anti-BNP hate sheets that lecture them about the Spanish Civil War.

So it was entirely predictable that the wartime black propagandist Sefton Delmer would be a hero to Gerry Gable, and that the methods Delmer and his fellow operatives at Bletchley Park used to try to damage the morale of the Axis forces and their collaborators would be studied avidly by *Searchlight* for anything that could be used against us.

Although better known for its code-breaking team, Bletchley Park also housed a radio operations section broadcasting to occupied Europe. Many of the stations were openly on the side of the Allies or various resistance movements. These had different political flavours in order to appeal to various groups in each target country.

Aimed at France, for example, was the hard-left Radio Travail with its calls for sabotage in the industrial north of the country, Radio Inconnue which broadcast ideas for passive resistance, and La France Catholique, aimed at Catholics and appearing to emanate from the Vatican. Radio Gaulle backed the Free French Forces, while Honneur et Patrie had two programmes each day which broadcast the orders of the Conseil de Resistance from London.

The propagation of disinformation can lead to the downfall of your nation



There was also a proliferation of black propaganda stations which were designed to appear to be run either by disillusioned members of the Axis armed forces or even by the German authorities or their allies.

For German ears, for example, there were Gustav Siegfried Eins with its old school reactionary conservative attacks on corruption in the Nazi regime, and Battlegroup Yorck, which was run by a Waffen SS deserter who had been smuggled into Sweden before ending up in Buckinghamshire running the station so it seemed to be broadcast by a group of high ranking but disillusioned SS officers in Germany.

The two most successful stations were Atlantik Sender, which broadcast popular music and news bulletins which included subversive black propaganda among genuine items to U-boat crews, and Soldaten Sender which aimed the same format at German forces stationed in France. A less important station, which nevertheless clocked up 275 programmes, was Wehrmachtssender Nord. This purported to be run by a German military unit stationed in Norway broadcasting an 'unintentionally' gloomy picture of life back in Germany.

Delmer, who had been born and raised in Berlin where his Australian father was a university lecturer, had great insight into the thought processes of the ordinary German in the street, and some of the tricks he and his colleagues used in the broadcasts caused

the German authorities very real problems.

Similar tricks were also deployed against the Italians. The bogus Radio Liberta, for example, put out 168 programmes in the second half of 1941, supposedly from a group of young disillusioned fascists, attacking Mussolini as a corrupt traitor and encouraging listeners to hoard items that were already scarce.

Later in the war a powerful transmitter was used to relay the genuine Italian Republican Fascist Radio with inserted subversive news items and talks which included an attack on the Vatican in the name of Fascism. Feedback showed that this station fooled many listeners.

'LET DOWN'

Significant success was also enjoyed by the Dutch station Blauwvoet, apparently run by a group of dissident collaborators who felt they had been let down by the Germans. It stirred up suspicions between different groups of collaborators and encouraged desertions from the lower ranks of pro-German parties by contrasting the hardships suffered by the rank-and-file with the corrupt luxuries it was claimed were enjoyed by their top brass.

Gable regarded Sefton Delmer as one of his heroes over several decades but, as both *Searchlight* and the nationalists it opposed both lacked radio stations, that admiration remained purely theoretical. The Internet, however, has changed all that.

Searchlight's analysts saw that there is a close similarity between a text-based websites and a radio station. Both are effectively anonymous, with the average audience member being unable to tell where they come from or to find out whether their producers are what they claim to be. Both can effortlessly mix truth and lies.

Gable & Co, facing a losing battle in their efforts to stop people voting for us, decided to step up their efforts to undermine our morale and thus cut the fund-raising and campaigning ability we have available to reach the voters. Effort was to be directed into running entirely bogus 'nationalist' websites and blogs, and other operatives were tasked with infiltrating and using genuine nationalist sites, inserting black propaganda lies into the patriotic 'grapevine'.

Several long-term *Searchlight* moles were largely taken off their previous roles of posing as active nationalists while spreading disinformation and gathering intelligence in their own areas, and set to work instead running nationalist pseudo-sites. Others have built up profiles as known contributors to nationalist forums, where they frequently pose as hardliners whose rhetoric puts off members of the public who stumble across their extremism while simultaneously trying to lead genuine nationalists into embittered despair.

There was a time when gossip, scandal

and fiction were fed to unsuspecting patriots, mixed with genuine news, through the pages of *Searchlight* itself. But the steady decline of the left over some three decades has closed so many of the old left-wing bookshop outlets that used to be the main distribution point that this technique was no longer effective. It was therefore decided to aim the printed magazine more at others on the left in an attempt to mobilise them, and to concentrate efforts to fool unwary nationalists online.

Which, when you think about it and if you are familiar with the murkier aspects of cyberspace, accounts for an awful lot of the anti-BNP propaganda that's out there waiting to ensnare the unwary.

How much impact this relatively recent tactic actually has is another matter entirely. When openly far-left sites, neo-Nazi cranks and the founders of failed factions all work in unholy alliance to do down the positive work of the British National Party, most of our people have already been wise enough to spot the trick and to discount it entirely.

But we have so little time left in which to achieve so much that for even one decent patriot to be demoralised or poisoned by their lies is one too many. Which is why, as a tsunami of economic chaos sweeps away the debt-ridden foundations of the liberal consensus, it is more important than ever that our activists understand just who is trying to drag us down and what tactics and guises they use to do so.

The very nature of black propaganda is such that it is impossible to extract truth from fiction; even allegations which are rejected at a conscious level tend to seep into the subconscious mind, where they eat away at trust, commitment and dedication. The only protection against the lies of the left is to avoid negative sites altogether.

This is true in all walks of life and in all endeavours; negative thoughts and images sink in subconsciously. Defence against them by reason and analysis is impossible precisely because they are fundamentally unreasonable and irrational. The only way to deal with negative tales or negative people is to avoid them altogether. Don't look, don't listen, don't repeat. And reprimand and if needs be shun any loudmouthed fools who do otherwise.

Thus forewarned and forearmed against a black propaganda offensive with its roots in the past but with the potential to undermine the future, we can concentrate on our own advances and the victories ahead.

Sometimes we too will be learning from and applying the lessons of history; sometimes, in the uncertain new world into which current events are right now plunging the entire population, we will be developing entirely new ways of progressing. The world is in flux, and if Gerry Gable thinks that he can stop us with a few stunts dredged from a sixty five year old sideshow, he's got another think coming!



CELTIC CROSS JEWELLERY

Online: <http://excalibur.bnp.org.uk>

PO Box 158, Deeside, CH5 2WW

Please make cheques/postal orders payable to "Excalibur"

Order Hotline: 0871 050 0242



Viking Rune Pendant

The Vikings were a mighty people who founded Russia, sailed the Atlantic as far as North America, settled Normandy in France, founded the settlement of Limerick in Ireland, and conquered much of northern England. This pendant, based on an actual Viking design found in Scandinavia, is finely handcrafted in pewter and is supplied with a stainless steel necklace.

Price: £9.38 including p&p



Epona Celtic Pendant

The Celtic goddess Epona was the protector of horses, donkeys, and mules. She was also a goddess of fertility. The worship of Epona was widespread in the Roman Empire between the first and third centuries CE. A wonderful example of zoomorphic Celtic art. Supplied with a stainless steel necklace. Handcrafted in England from pewter.

Price: £9.38 including p&p

In the nineteenth century, people were so convinced of the Christian doctrine of free will that an inquiry into the causes of a particular form of behaviour would have left most people feeling quite baffled. Behaviour was explained by the exercise of free will and the particular individual exercising it. That was all that needed to be said.

The early twentieth century saw a decline in respect for the doctrine of free will and an increase in the quest for external explanations for behaviour. This quest has continued into the twenty-first century.

These explanations fall into two categories: hereditary and environmental causes or, if you prefer it, nature and nurture. When we attempt to explain animal behaviour, both are considered objectively and conclusions are drawn on the strength of the evidence. When the Dangerous Dogs Act was passed in 1991, it was acknowledged that certain breeds of dog had a predisposition to aggression and ownership of these types was prohibited. There were no canine sociologists ready to leap to the rescue of an erring pit bull to say that family background might be to blame and the absence of positive male role models might be the cause. Pit bull terriers were declared to be dangerous per se even if they had never so much as dreamt an aggressive thought. Nevertheless, it is recognised, with other breeds, that good training and control can prevent a potentially dangerous animal from fulfilling its potential.

In the first half of the twentieth century, there were objective searches for causes of human behaviour, exploring both possible hereditary causes and environmental influences. However, the advance of Sociology (often as an unwanted garnish added to almost every other subject) has led to the closing of a whole range of avenues of inquiry.

Sociology defines itself as the study of social influences on society and tends to exclude absolutely, even the consideration of hereditary causes. I remember from my undergraduate days a Sociology tutorial in which our tutor, a South African exile, challenged us to think of any form of human behaviour that might be definitely instinctive and not learned. Various suggestions were made and routinely dismissed. Even the suggestion of a baby suckling on the nipple was consigned to the category of learned behaviour. I do not remember any other member of the tutorial group even questioning the nonsense that

we were being taught. I became convinced, from that moment, that Sociology was designed to stop people from thinking intelligently and critically about social phenomena.

Sociology's campaign against intelligent thought has spread throughout the chattering classes: politicians, journalists, administrators, professionals and academics. When the question of the cause of a social problem arises, all have been programmed into knowing the questions that they must ask and those that they must avoid. All know, almost intuitively, the hypotheses that they must allow and those that must be excluded from the debate. Indeed, they must be excluded from their conscious thoughts. The chattering classes have been educated superbly to know how to stop themselves from thinking.

Gang culture, the absence of fathers from families, deprivation, educational under-achievement (under what is not explained) and the ubiquitous discrimination are all suggested as possible causes of gun and knife crime. I do not think that I have yet heard that defective potty training might be the root cause but I am sure that I shall.

HEREDITARY EXCLUDED

The excluded hypotheses are the hereditary ones - both individual and group explanations. There are two questions that I would ask, not to advance a theory you understand, merely to avoid excluding a hypothesis. My first question: "Is there any evidence that the immediate family members or earlier forebears of the individual perpetrators have a history of violence?" Secondly: "Is there any correlation between any particular hereditary background and the commission of gun and knife crime?" Do Orcadian fisher folk or Suffolk arable farmers feature disproportionately among the perpetrators of gun and knife crime? I am sure that the vast majority of Orkney fishermen and Suffolk yeomen are pacific and law abiding but (and I ask this cautiously lest I offend my Scottish/Norse or East Anglian friends), do these groups have an unusually violent past?

Sorry, have I committed a faux pas? Perhaps I have (figuratively) broken wind in public? The painful silence is almost deafening. I think that we had better go back to free will or, failing that, defective potty training. At least we shall then know where we are.

» Nationalist veteran Andrew Brons says that too much emphasis has been given to the environmental causes of gun and knife crime and not enough to the 'elusive' hereditary cause.

The Elusive Causes of Gun & Knife Crime

Destroying British Identity

» Ben Myles, an academic living in Seoul, South Korea, highlights the effects that multinational corporations and the super-rich have had on the British economy and traditional way of life.

Globalisation (an interdependent global economy) really came into being during the period of Pax Britannica in the 19th century, a century which also saw the rise of nationalism, leading in the 20th century to the collapse of multinational empires such as the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian amid much bloodshed. We are now seeing this process going into reverse. The EU has played a crucial role but there is another crucial force driving this denationalisation - multinational corporations.

Traditionally, it was the Labour party who defended the rights of British workers against big business but that changed forever with the election of Tony Blair in 1997. Blair had built a new Labour coalition of middle class liberal urbanites (who could feel good voting Labour without worrying about it hurting their prosperity) and ethnic minorities who were given preference over the White working class (who as voters were presumed to have nowhere else to go).

Blair and his coterie had calculated that as long as the middle class were kept happy, New Labour would stay in power. So they set out to outdo the Tories and make Britain the most big business friendly place on Earth. This meant generous tax breaks to huge multinationals and the very rich - so generous in fact that thousands of super-rich non-doms like Rupert Murdoch and Phillip Green don't pay a penny in tax. In Labour's Britain an incredible state of affairs exists where those who earn the most pay the least taxes. (It is no wonder that Britain has the lowest rates of social mobility in the developed World!)

Of course the super-rich contribute in other ways, making donations into the coffers of the Labour and Conservative parties. British politics today resembles American politics more and more, with parties dependent on the millions in campaign funds they receive from wealthy backers. This of course buys them immense influence. George Bush rewarded his backers with a \$3 trillion tax cut. Heavily dependent on oil money, he also repealed environmental protection laws and launched the Iraq war.

LAB-CON WEALTHY BACKERS

In Britain, politicians are also in thrall to their wealthy backers. Part of the reason that Labour and Conservative are now almost identical



is because they dare not offend their backers, such as Rupert Murdoch, whose support Tony Blair so desperately courted in 1997. Through his vast media empire which includes Sky, *The Times* and *The Sun*, Murdoch can make or break a political party. He was widely credited with winning Blair that election, though Labour, which won by a landslide, probably did not need him.

Another way the super-rich get their own way is by threatening to relocate with all their billions. This threat of relocation always leads to a complete capitulation by the government. In reality, these corporations probably would not relocate as they depend on Britain for much of their profits. Yet how much benefit do these groups or individuals really bring? Undoubtedly some are beneficial and may be worth appeasing. Yet others such as the Murdoch Group actually drain wealth from the country. If that pernicious media organisation went elsewhere, Britain would not only be a nicer place but job losses would be short term as other (British owned) media corporations would quickly fill the void. An added attraction would be that a foreign national would no longer be dictating Britain's political agenda.

Phillip Green, unlike Murdoch, is not a force for evil (his clothes do not twist young minds), yet he, like thousands of others, avoids paying any taxes as a non-dom. Green cannot even threaten to relocate his business as the British High Street is his marketplace.

It seems that in liberal eyes corporate greed is okay so long as it entails foreigners taking profits out of Britain rather than the other way round. It is another example of how viscerally anti-British the left-liberal agenda is. They overlook the fact that if Britain lost its multi-million pound overseas orders their wealth would be seriously affected as well.

One often hears the statement that immigration is good for the British economy, a euphemism which actually means that immigration is good for business.

In the 19th century perhaps as many
as 2 million famine Irish (many
of our ancestors)

ancestors) flooded into Britain. This was a boon for business, as these impoverished immigrants would work for much lower wages than their British counterparts, but it was a disaster for poorer Britons and one of the reasons the Irish were so hated during that period.

During the 1950s and '60s hundreds of thousands of West Indians and Asians were allowed into Britain at the behest of big business. The fears of the British people were completely ignored and we are now living with the consequences of this Third World influx: terrorism and escalating knife crime. In spite of all the problems this first wave of immigrants had caused, the Labour government arrogantly ignored the wishes of the majority of British people and allowed in an even larger wave of Third World immigrants and asylum seekers. The result has been a reduction in real wages, even greater social breakdown, and an epidemic of violence and terrorism. Of course whenever there is another terrorist attack or knife murder the politicians make all the right noises. But once the furore has died down, it is back to business as usual in Great Britain PLC.

Global corporations don't have our best interests at heart; they have their own. Multinationals are not concerned with wider social issues! They get the benefit of cheap immigrant labour and higher profits without paying for the downside: the burden to the NHS, the education system, the harm done to society etc. They don't pick up the tax bill, you do!

The multinational Corporations want a homogenised world. National identity, and workers' solidarity are obstacles to achieving a global free market where they can sell uniform products, put all the little guys out of business and make even bigger profits.

Divide and rule has long been used to subjugate nations. The British Empire used it. Immigrants are the perfect tool as they have no bonds of loyalty to their host country. These days when a politician says that something is good for the British economy (they never say good for the British people!) it probably means it is going to be bad for you. In this corporate dictatorship ordinary people get to vote every few years (Communist Russia also had elections) but there is no real choice as both parties will never go against the interests of their business backers.

But the triumph of Corporatism may not be a foregone conclusion. The economic bubble has now burst and the middle class are starting to be hurt too. Many things such as public school education have now been priced out of their reach by this influx of foreign money. It does not help either to see the super-rich getting even richer while recession affects the lower and middle classes.

Free market Capitalism has been exposed as not working in the best interests of most people. Market forces were meant to provide free competition but instead they are being manipulated in favour of the rich and powerful. Not only that, but the rich and powerful even receive billions in subsidies from the government when their greed backfires. It's called corporate welfare and it makes one wonder whether Britain is going the way of Africa or South America.

The class war which fashionable politicians thought was a thing of the past may be returning with a vengeance. Except this time it will be a feudal struggle between the super-rich elite, the New Olympians, and the rest of us. Incredibly Labour, once the party of the working man, is now the mouthpiece of this unelected global aristocracy. Will it be the BNP, a party Labour and its liberal friends damn as extreme right wing, which will champion the ordinary man and woman?

Has Extreme Right wing, in liberal speak, come to mean anti the obscenely rich, global elite? Does left wing by that benchmark come to mean pro extremely rich, undemocratic elite? True working class movements have at their heart always been national or local movements and the BNP, like Robin Hood, must now protect the denigrated underdog, the British working man, from these unelected, overseas tyrants.



Democracy in Decay

“Democracy is government of the people, by the people, for the people.” Abraham Lincoln uttered those now immortal words well over a century ago. If only it really was possible, in a perfect society, to have government by the people and for the people, although we patriots believe it is. However, the Westminster system has moved so far beyond being a true “democracy” that there is now no connection whatsoever.

The word “democracy” is handed down to us from ancient Athens. “Demos” means “people”; hence democracy is government of the people and with their participation. Although ancient Athens is generally considered to be the birthplace of democracy, it goes back much further than its inception in 508 BC on the Acropolis. Some limited form of citizen democracy existed in the ancient states of Mesopotamia (Sumeria for instance). It also made an appearance in the ancient states of India, although in limited form. But generally speaking the true birth of Western democracy took place in Athens, along with many other Hellenic states during that period.

It is a common misconception that after the fall of Greece, the democratic torch passed to the infant Roman Republic, where it burned until the emergence of the dictatorial Caesars. This view is false. Rome was never a real democracy but an oligarchy, consisting of an aristocracy of rich, landowning blue-blooded nobles ruling common folk from the marble seats of the Senate.

Before we continue we must first give ourselves a brief outline of what exactly is “democracy” and what constitutes a democratic political system. Democracy rests on several pillars, chief amongst which is the “majority vote”. In any supposed democratic institution, the majority vote is binding on all concerned. This is to prevent a minority group imposing its will on the majority. Then there is the notion that a democratic system must be open to all

citizens, and all citizens can participate. Finally there is the procedure called an “election”, where all citizens must be allowed to vote for any candidate to be elected as their representative. Democracy takes on many forms and shapes, and is not limited to any particular formula. Wherever democracy is to be found, however, it generally adheres to the aforementioned principles of the majority vote, free elections, and the participation of all free citizens.

Now versed in the history and general principles of “democracy”, we come to an examination of the Westminster British political system. It must first be said that once upon a time the British political system, consisting of a council of ministers (headed by a prime minister) answerable to a parliament of free citizens, which is also vested with legislative powers, was the envy of the world. Several centuries ago our political system was efficient, provided good government and stability, ruled in es

harmony with the people and withstood wars, empire, global expansion and colonisation. But with the passing of time and the emergence of other centres of power, such as the media, reform was badly needed, or even a complete redesign. In the Britain of today, our once great political system does not provide good government, is not efficient, and does not represent the people nor protect the nation. The British political system is now nothing but a chaotic circus, behind which vested interests groups impose their ideology and will on the British people.

To begin with, a general election is held roughly every five years to elect a new government, ostensibly to serve the British people [sic]. This short time-frame forces every elected government to think short-term. No long-term plans, especially if they are costly, are bothered with because the horizon only stretches as far as five years down the road (maximum). The future of the nation could depend on a costly new s

» Part 1: How it reached its hollow sham. Paul Golding examines the recurring problems with democracy and proposes solutions, some of which are not necessarily BNP policy but are put forward for discussion. In part one, he examines the origins of democracy and the workings of the British political system.

military system, or perhaps a radical overhaul of the national sewage system, but no government wishes to take a lead due to the next, almost instantly impending, general election. This short-term mania means that almost as fast as government is elected to govern, preparation begins for the next election.

Being elected into power (i.e. depending on the approval of voters) on a short basis, means that politicians find their field of action severely curtailed to that which is popular. Everything that is done or adopted must be popular, lest the rug is pulled from under your feet by angry voters at the next polling day. How is a government supposed to implement national policy when it must first ascertain whether or not such a measure would be attractive to voters? If it is found that it is not to the voters' liking, then surely the government, and especially its members, will put their generous salaries and careers first and consign the necessary measure to the dustbin. Should a

government not, once in receipt of a mandate via a successful election, simply get on with the job of providing government and do what is right, regardless of its appeal to a whole multitude of voters who, in any case, have already voted? When power rests with consent from voters, how can a government do what is right and what is needed, when these things happen to be unpopular? Bearing the responsibility for running the country, and hence addressing its many problems, a government is locked into a straightjacket of action determined by the never-ending national popularity contest.

The government in Britain is given a mandate to rule in a free election in which all citizens participate, which basically means that the most popular political party always wins. In such a short-term system as the Westminster one, nothing can be done which is unpopular. Unable to sit down to the task of running the country, a government must stay well clear of any policy which may be unpopular even if it was vital to the security and future of Britain. Any elected government in Britain usually consists of dozens of senior and junior ministers, each with a career and a generous salary, and families in tow that depend on the success of the career and the size of the salary.

Would any man jeopardize his popularity (hence his votes, his career, his salary) to ensure that something vital but unpopular was implemented by government and Britain eventually became better off? Or would he play the popularity game and promise anything to the gullible voters in order to maintain himself in his newly acquired surroundings?

To make matters worse, an elected British government usually has to fight multiple mid-term local or Euro elections. These inevitably turn into nothing more than referendums on the performance of the government so far. So, once in office, an elected government has the dread that if, God forbid, they should do the honourable thing and pursue something which is unpopular but necessary, they will pay for it with their careers and salary at the next

polling day in a mere five years time. Also those years are littered with multiple opportunities for the voters to sting the government and cause it embarrassment, each such incident making it more and more likely that when the five years are up they will get the boot.

Under this "system", government and the electoral process becomes nothing more than a glorified popularity contest, and when elected, nothing can be done which is unpopular. The urge to be endlessly popular forces prospective politicians to promise the world in order to get elected (hence the career boost and salary) and to stay elected. This rat-race gradually lowers the previously high level grade of politics in this country, until we end up where we are today, where politicians are about as trusted or respected as a dodgy second-hand car salesman. In fact the word "politician", in the modern age, is synonymous with lying, deceit and broken promises. Peter Osborne wrote in *The Rise of Political Lying*, "In recent years mendacity and deception have ceased to be abnormal and become an entrenched feature of the British system." Mr Osborne is spot on; further comment is academic.

THE PARTY WAR GAME

As if it wasn't bad enough that an elected government must debase itself by playing the popularity game instead of engaging in mature leadership of the nation, it faces another usually insuperable obstacle in governing the nation: the workings of parliament and the never-ending party war. Approaching a general election, the prospective political parties usually bite and scratch like cats in order to gain advantage, not by rolling out their policies and addressing issues affecting the nation, but by engaging in false "promises", "vows" and "pledges". The party with the lowest honourable intentions and thus able to promise the voters anything is usually the party that wins. This never-ending pressure away from mature and constructive politics, and into the politics of the liar, cheat and professional deceiver, is an ever present



unseen force pushing politics in the wrong direction. Anyone honourable enough to engage in constructive politics finds himself at a crippling disadvantage to the determined scoundrel ready to promise the voters anything.

Then, once the election is over, we have a polarisation: on one side is the party that won, and on the other side, all the parties that lost. Now for the next five years, thanks to the scramble for salaries and career advancement, the side that lost (which encompasses several parties) has a vested interest in seeing to it that the side that won fails miserably (because they seek office and its perks for themselves). So with only five years to govern the nation, and that five years a veritable minefield of mid-term elections (popularity contests), they also face a coterie of political parties gunning for them to fail. Thus the job of government becomes, literally, a tricky assignment of doing the impossible while maintaining popularity with the voters, and wrestling off the determined efforts of the opposition groups!

This opposition, however, is not without teeth. They occupied somewhere around half the seats in parliament, and hence can vote against the incumbent government at every opportunity.

In theory elections sound reasonable enough: all citizens vote for whichever candidate they choose, and even have the option of standing themselves. But how do these voters exercise their choice? How do y

they keep abreast of the policies of all the prospective political parties? True, they may be in receipt of leaflets and other material from candidates or parties; they may even be fortunate enough to receive a doorstep visit from the candidates or their representatives. But for those of us who live in the real world, the chief source of information in the modern age is the media (newspapers, television and radio). If the media dominates the information that voters use to determine their choice, then in effect it is the media that decides elections. Should the media ostracise a particular party or candidate, their chances of success are effectively destroyed. Should the media determine that a particular party or candidate is "beyond the pale", and opts to ignore or exclude them from the process, their prospects are severely diminished. It's all well and nice having a system where people can vote for whomever, but without unfettered access to information that choice is extremely restricted.

One of the principal problems with modern democracy is that we encourage everyone to hold "opinions" about things they know nothing about. Should an ordinary voter be asked a question concerning any particular issue about which he knows little or nothing, he does not respectfully decline to answer and state, "I don't possess enough knowledge on that subject, so I will do the right thing and not answer." Instead, in our liberalised political landscape, the voter will no doubt do his on

best to answer the question, but what usually follows is not a calculated answer based on knowledge, but a robotic rehash of what they have last seen on TV, heard on the radio, or read in the gutter press.

Until we have true press freedom in this country, with all views, opinions and parties given equal prominence, our political system will continue to be dominated by the media, and the voters will remain slaves, depending on a handful of media bosses for enlightenment. In the words of Thomas Jefferson, "Whenever the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government." Sadly in Britain this is not the case; the people are not "well-informed", but are only allowed to see a highly circumscribed version of events that has been vetted and clipped to the media bosses' satisfaction, and always made to fit with the prevailing liberal-Marxist political orthodoxy.

CONCEALING INFORMATION

"In true democracy every man and women is taught to think for himself or herself," said Gandhi. Wise words indeed, but in modern Britain there is something very sinister going on which renders Gandhi's observation superfluous. In modern Britain, there is an enormous concealment of information in operation, principally revolving around the topic of history. The average citizen of this country, from birth to adulthood, is not imbued with knowledge k



of the world, of Britain, of history, of politics, of economics, of philosophy, of practically anything. The one thing that would allow for true democracy, using Gandhi's calculation, is that any person should be taught to think for themselves. But how is it possible to "think for yourself" if you have no knowledge to start with in order to make a worthwhile, intelligent choice?

Obviously the objective of the Establishment is to prevent the populace from possessing general knowledge and an understanding of history so they can think for themselves. Couple this with encouragement to hold or voice "opinions", and what we have is a bulk of blank-minded media parrots. Until citizens have instilled in them a vast and varied knowledge of the world and of their own country and history, then we won't have "true democracy", as described by Gandhi. "The best argument against democracy is a five minute conversation with the average voter," said Winston Churchill. To avoid this cynical situation, we must train people for politics, by providing them with a full education, which is denied to them today. Again we quote Thomas Jefferson: "I know of no safe repository of the ultimate power of society but people. And if we think them not enlightened enough, the remedy is not to take the power from them, but to inform them by education."

Should a government be democratically elected, they then are prevented from the

implementing their policies by the mass of opposition groups found on the other side of the House of Commons. Elected to carry out certain specific manifesto pledges, they have to beg and plead with all manner of anonymous nonentities in order to do what they were elected to do. A government, lacking the executive or legislative power to carry out their programme, despite the mandate from the voters in the election, now has to reduce itself to ridicule by compromising with those who do not share the responsibility for running the country. As stated earlier, the elected government sets out to govern the nation, and the other side, now called the "opposition", seeking the perks of office for themselves, expends all energies to stop it governing! Is it any wonder that, faced with this organised political chaos, George Bernhard Shaw said: "Democracy is a device that ensures we shall be governed no better than we deserve."


I hope that after this intensive look at the machinations of the British political system, everyone will join me in declaring that there exist enormous problems, flaws and weaknesses in our body politic. Can we honestly, with hand on heart, describe the Westminster system as a "democracy", in the manner of ancient Athens? If our "system" is not a democracy, then is there another term from the political dictionary that accurately describes it?

After some research, I feel confident that I have discovered two terms which, all

when used simultaneously, hit the intended target with precision. The Westminster system can, quite deservedly, be called an oligarchy. This term also originates in the fertile heritage of ancient Hellenic Greece. "Oligarchy" is a form of government where political power effectively rests with a small segment of society, with a specific class or elite. This accurately describes the Westminster model, for as we all know, politicians (and their fellow tribes people, the journalists) are a species unto themselves, with their own views, interests and loyalties, completely detached from the rest of us poor plebs.

Add to our search another equally fitting term, and we have hit the proverbial jackpot. The Westminster system is not only an oligarchy, but also a plutocracy. Plutocracy is government by those with money, by those with enough financial clout to grease the wheels of our democratic machine. As we patriotic nationalists know only too well, access to money makes all the difference in modern politics. Google describes a plutocracy as being, "a form of oligarchy where the state's power is centralised in an affluent social class." Therefore we can confidently (and accurately), describe Britain as an oligarchic plutocracy, not a democracy.


Part two examines the principles of democracy itself and proposes a new structure that will eliminate many of the problems with our political system.



March of the Titans: A History of the White Race

By Arthur Kemp

The complete and comprehensive history of the White Race, spanning 350 centuries of tumultuous events. Revealed in this work is the one true cause of the rise and fall of the world's greatest empires - that all civilisations rise and fall according to their ethnic homogeneity and nothing else - a nation can survive wars, defeats, natural catastrophes, but not racial dissolution. A revolutionary new view of history and of the cause of the crisis facing modern Europe, this will change your understanding of history, race and society. *Paperback, 596 pp, £25.25 inc*



Jihad: Islam's 1,300 Year War on Western Civilisation

By Arthur Kemp

For centuries, violent Muslims have been trying to capture Europe for Islam. Sweeping out from its origin in Saudi Arabia, Islam has expanded through violent conquest into North Africa, the Middle and Near East and very nearly into Europe itself, attacking through Spain, Italy, and the Balkans. Each time, the Islamic hordes were turned back by a united European military effort. Today, the Islamic invasion is not being carried out with sieges, scimitars, or cannon, but rather by immigration, birth rates, and demographics. Given current trends, Europe is set to be overrun before the end of this century. *Paperback, 62 pp, £8.95 inc p&p.*

Order Hotline: 0871 050 0242

Online: <http://excalibur.bnp.org.uk>

PO Box 158, Deeside, CH5 2WW - Please make cheques/postal orders payable to "Excalibur"

EXCALIBUR

GREAT WHITE

www.greatwhiterecords.com



Men's t-shirt with GWR logo and record on the front, available in Medium, Large and X-Large

£12.50
Inc p&p



Men's t-shirt with GWR logo on the front, available in Medium, Large and X-Large

£12.50
Inc p&p



NEW

Women's t-shirt with GWR logo on the front, available in Medium, Large and X-Large

£12.50
Inc p&p

NEW

Order online or you can send a cheque made payable to 'Great White Records' to PO Box 158, Deeside, CH5 2WW.

Order Hotline: 0871 050 0242

A Future Where the BNP has Failed

Dr Stanton's comments on necessitating capital punishment, compulsory euthanasia, compulsory sterilisation and assisted suicide in order to reduce our population level are unjustified and abhorrent. Any nation that resorts to the tactics he suggests to enable national stability is usually weak, backward and socially undeveloped. His proposals might be applicable and attractive to the authorities of Zimbabwe but not to the UK. The UK is not weak, backward nor socially undeveloped and does not need to resort to such barbarism.

It is the British way to embrace our disabled, not murder them; to give dying people temporary solace not speed up the process; to strengthen the weaker elements not sterilise them, and not to encourage suicide but to instil hope and deter potential victims from it. We have seen enough of the latter in Bridgend over the last twelve months.

As for capital punishment, the recent event concerning the acquittal of the person stitched up for the murder of Jill Dandoe eight years ago shows that apart from its third world barbarism capital punishment (the cold and calculated murder of our own people by the state to maintain control) is totally unsafe in relation to what is just.

The two hundred-year-old theory developed by the clergyman Thomas Malthus, in line with which Dr Stanton presents his argument, is today defunct. The Malthus theory was born from the psyche of a religious zealot whose mode of thought is today two hundred years out of date. The problem over which Dr Stanton elaborates will be alleviated when the current flood of immigration initiated by our plutocracy is stemmed and then reversed bringing our population back to its natural level.

Dr Stanton envisages a cure giving little consideration to the cause. He appears to be envisaging the consequences of a future where the BNP has failed. If we rectify the cause there will be no need to even consider such drastic and barbaric measures in the Stanton Malthus Cure.

Phillip White,
Bridgend, Glamorgan

Realistic and Practical

I was interested to see Dr. William Stanton's interesting essay *Our Future is Malthusian* in your August 2008 edition and pleased to note that his approach to these potentially catastrophic issues is both realistic and practical. However, I would also like to add a few thoughts of my own with regard to the future consequences of uncontrolled population growth.

In his seminal text, *To End Poverty: The Starvation of the Periphery by the Core* [Alternative Green, 1997] the radical decentralist thinker, Richard Hunt, informs us that 'in Britain there are about 33 million acres of farmland, excluding rough grazing. There are about 58 million people, about half an acre per person' [p.201]. He also calculates that 'a family needs about 8 acres to be self-sufficient. That means Britain could support a population of about 15 million self-sufficiently, without exploiting anyone else.' [Ibid.] However, whilst Richard is correct when he goes on to explain that cutting the size of the political unit is futile if no attempts are made to reduce the population, I believe that such a reduction is inevitable and, therefore, something which will happen naturally. Indeed, when during a telephone conversation I asked Richard to elaborate upon his theory, he put forward one or two additional examples of how to reduce the population, namely, cutting child benefit for the rich, opposing immigration, discouraging large families and offering support for abortion and contraception. But I would go even further and suggest that all attempts to achieve political, social and economic decentralisation by reforming the present system are doomed to failure. Quite simply, it is out of our hands. Let me explain further.

According to the Revolutionary Conservative thinker, Oswald Spengler, human cultures and civilisations are purely organic in nature. Even more important is the fact that all great empires, civilisations and historical peaks are transitory and both grow and wither in accordance with the remorseless march of Time itself. In the words of Spengler, 'the great cultures accomplish their majestic wave-cycles. They appear suddenly, swell in splendid lines, flatten again and vanish, and the face of the waters is once more a sleeping waste.' [*The Decline of the West*, Munich, 1926, p.73.] The Italian philosopher, Julius Evola, remarks upon this process when comparing American civilisation with that of Europe. Indeed, whilst America is far younger in terms of the fact that European civilisation has been around far longer than its more arrogant cousin, Evola believes that America is already in the final stages of decline: 'The structure of history is however, cyclical not evolutionary. It is far from being the case that the most recent civilisations are necessarily "superior". They may be, in fact, senile and decadent. [*American 'Civilisation' in Further*

Our Future May Be Malthusian

» Some of our readers' comments on Dr William Stanton's article *Our Future is Malthusian* published in the August issue.

Thoughts of Julius Evola, The Rising Press, 2001, p.18.]

Edward Gibbon says much the same thing in *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* [Chatto & Windus, 1960, p. 524-5]: 'the demise of Rome was the natural and inevitable effect of immoderate greatness. Prosperity ripened the principle of decay; the cause of destruction multiplied with the extent of conquest; and as soon as time or accident had removed the artificial supports, the stupendous fabric yielded to the pressure of its own weight. The story of its ruin is simple and obvious; and instead of inquiring why the Roman Empire was destroyed, we should rather be surprised that it had subsisted so long.' So what has all this to do with reducing the population?

My basic contention is that International Capitalism will eventually overreach itself with disastrous consequences, and, just like the seemingly indestructible civilisations of Egypt, Greece, Rome and the British Empire, is destined to come crashing down like the proverbial house of cards. In other words, attempts to reform the system will only prolong the inevitable demise of the system itself. Furthermore, whilst being very gradual in nature (allowing the most pragmatic individuals to pool their resources and create fresh alternatives on the periphery) the penultimate collapse of the bureaucratic core will have devastating effects on population levels. The State will become an irrelevancy and its disappearance will be followed by famine, disease and internecine conflict. Richard Hunt's 'grubby utopia' will seem like a breath of fresh air once the local mafiosi, drug barons and criminal opportunists have taken advantage of the situation. Amidst burnt-out cars, empty factories and the smouldering ruins of the newly-slain technocracy, the dazed hunter-gatherers who remain will count their lucky stars that they got out whilst there was still time. Returning to Spengler: 'At this level all civilisations enter upon a stage, which lasts for centuries, of appalling depopulation. The whole pyramid of cultural man vanishes. It crumbles from the summit, first the world-cities, then the provincial forms and finally the land itself, whose best blood has incontinently poured into the

towns, merely to bolster them up awhile. At the last, only the primitive blood remains, alive, but robbed of its strongest and most promising elements.' [p.251]

The population of the British Isles will not be significantly reduced either by halting immigration or by implementing a series of reforms pertaining to birth control. On the contrary, mankind is part of a perpetual cycle which is ultimately determined by extraneous powers beyond our control, although this should not cause us to shirk our responsibilities. According to Evola: 'It is typical of a heroic vocation to face the greatest wave knowing that two destinies lie ahead: that of those who will die with the dissolution of the modern world, and that of those who will find themselves in the main and regal stream of the new current.' [*Revolt Against the Modern World*, Inner Traditions, 1995, p.366.] Under the circumstances, therefore, the best that we can do is to prepare for the inevitability of this fact.

**Troy Southgate,
South London.**



Population Growth Unsustainable

If anyone should doubt that the ever expanding world population is unsustainable then they only need to look and understand the implications of the Human Population Spike shown on Dr Stanton's graph. He is right to suggest that this can only lead to a calamitous situation of famine and world-wide strife.

Malthus made his prediction before the industrial revolution had really started, and as Dr Stanton indicates the advent of harnessing power - particularly the internal combustion engine - to agricultural methods meant that for two centuries we could cope with the extra millions of mouths to feed, mainly in Afro-Asia. Now we have reached the end-point of the extra time that this progress allowed.

The problem is that while most readers will agree with Dr Stanton's analysis of the situation the world has now reached, how can any political party expect to win votes by suggesting that we must practice euthanasia? The editor seems to have realised this with his skillful comments within the article. We should now take up the issue and look for a more rational way of tackling this major problem.

Colin Hartley
Northumberland

Not Politically Correct

The scenario suggested by Dr Stanton is no more shocking or apocalyptic than the post-'Nuclear Holocaust' scenario depicted in the BBC television plays *The Offshore Island* and *Threads*, or even the somewhat different spectacle presented in the film *Mad Max*.

The media has had no hesitation in popularising the nuclear-nightmare idea, because it accords with the anti-nuclear hysteria and anti-Western bias of CND. The ideas of Dr Stanton are denied a hearing because they are not politically correct, and because Malthusian ideas run counter to the Enlightenment belief (now surely reaching its end) of unlimited progress.

Gordon Clack
Gloucester

How To Be A School Gov

» If you have become disillusioned with what the schools are teaching and the way your children are being educated, you may be able to change it. Become a school governor. Based on some personal experience, Joan Green tells us how to do it.

School governors are volunteers who can bring a broad spectrum of interests and expertise to a school. The broader the life experience the better. You don't need to be a specialist in the field. Anyone with an interest in education can be a governor.

The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) says that it takes about six hours a month of your time attending meetings and working to further the school's development. In practice, with background reading and attending school functions, it could take considerably more time than that. Meetings are held at the school once a month and attendance is vital, almost compulsory. You sign up for a four-year stint, but if circumstances force you to resign earlier, nobody will chop your head off.

Every school has a governing body and every governing body has three kinds of members: parent governors, school staff governors and representatives of the local authority (usually councillors). Most schools also have community governors who are ordinary members of the public, preferably with business experience, and some schools have foundation governors.

Governors with expert knowledge or particular interests sit on advisory school committees such as finance, health and safety, special needs, sports, music and so on. Training and guidance is given for these roles.

Governors are important to the school. Together with the head teacher they set policy and budgets. They make decisions about performance targets and the school's future development, they monitor the impact of those policies and they respond to inspection recommendations. They consider complaints and hear appeals from pupils and staff.

The DfES has designed a national training scheme for the induction of new school governors. The course covers roles and



responsibilities. Most local education authorities supplement the national programme with training courses of their own. They also have governor support teams. In addition, there is an advice line and a free, national telephone helpline service as a back-up resource.

Many inner city schools, along with those in difficulties, have many governor vacancies and you would be welcomed there with open arms. The government has set up a School Governors' One-Stop Shop to help these areas. This can be accessed at 64 Essex Road, London, N1 8LR (telephone 0870 241 3883 or 020 7288 1720) or info@schoolgovernors-oss.co.uk.

Don't be shy about phoning up your local school, expressing an interest and asking to go along for an informal talk with the head teacher. Most schools keep waiting lists if their board is full, but on the whole you will probably be welcomed with open arms.

If you don't want to plunge in with a visit to your local school, you can phone up your local or county education department and express an interest. They will send you an application form for governor services registration. You fill in your name, address, telephone numbers and details of any skills, knowledge or experience which you think could be useful.

If you have ever been a youth leader, scout or guide member, done voluntary work, cycled a charity ride, climbed a mountain, run a meeting, belonged to a choir or local group such as the WI, Young Farmers, Allotment Club, Fishing Club, Recycling Club, Neighbourhood Watch, edited a newsletter, had an article published or held an office in any club, put it down. Your business or professional experience is invaluable. Management skills, accounting and book keeping skills, organizing skills, bringing up children; these are all precious life experiences you should mention. Keep political interests out of it at this stage.

You then indicate which type of schools you wish to be considered for (primary, secondary, specialist) and name the school which your child attends - if you have one of school age.

The law says that you cannot be a school governor if you have ever been bankrupt or disqualified as a company director, if you are detained under the Mental Health Act, if you have served three months in prison in the last five years or two and a half years in prison in the previous 20 years or have ever been sentenced to five years or more. Also prohibited are those restricted from working with children or young persons, disqualified as a teacher or anyone who has refused to undertake a Criminal Record Bureau check (which is compulsory if you wish to serve as a school governor).

INTERVIEW TIPS

If you apply to a particular school and have no child attending it, you may be invited for an interview. Head teachers might have a policy of interviewing all applicants; you never can tell. In any case, it is wise to be forearmed for this eventuality. Here is a bit of help.

At an interview you will almost certainly be asked why you want to be a school governor and also perhaps, why you chose that particular school. Your reply should be genuine, warm and sincere.

Useful answers might be that you want to put back into society some of the good things you have taken out of it. "Life has been good to me, now I want to put something back to help others."

Say that you remember your own school days with warmth and affection. You remember particular teachers who set you on a lifelong path of learning. You could say that you remember teachers who kindled an interest in a hobby which has become a lifetime's interest and helped you discover more about the world than would otherwise have been possible.

Be sincere and honest and, above all, be enthusiastic. A good teacher can enrich someone's life. Say you want to help to pass this on to others. Praise the school for its high standards and community involvement. Say you want to help maintain standards and - if possible - improve them.

Never say anything negative. Never put the teaching profession down. Never say that any school or any teaching method is a failure. Do not mention politics or (unless it is a church school) religion.

Be positive; be full of praise and enthusiasm. Say you want to be part of a team. Say our children are our future. Say you want to invest in that future. Say you are proud of your community and the school is the hub of that community.

School governors are in a rare position of being able to change things (slow and easy, little by little). Most of us nowadays don't believe we can make a difference. If you are burning to do so, have a go. Become a school governor. The future of our country depends on our children. The future of our children depends on us. Help them by guiding them. It could be one of the most rewarding things you ever do.

Further information

For more information you can visit the Department for Education and Skills website for school governors at: www.dfes.gov.uk/governor/index.htm.

You can write for a booklet *Help Schools, Help Children* and other information from the Department for Education and Skills Publications, PO box 5050, Sherwood Park Annesley, Nottingham NG1 0DJ (telephone: 0845 60 222 60. email: dfes@prolog.uk.com).

Your local authority education department is listed in the telephone book under Local Authority or County Council. Phone them up and ask for information. They will send you a booklet and application form.

John Bean's Nationalist Notebook

London Councils Stops Searchlight Funding

Over in Essex there is a BNP activist who is even older than your editor and has stood as a BNP candidate in several local elections. He is Sid Chaney, who has launched many legal cases against some of the activities of the left, and the *Searchlight* organisation in particular. Some he has lost, others he has won.

He has just informed me of a notable victory whereby as a result of continual badgering of the Association of London Government (now renamed as London Councils) it no longer provides any grant funding to *Searchlight*. In a letter to Mr Chaney from Christiane Jenkins, Director of Corporate Governance at the Association, she writes:


"I can confirm that the Association (renamed London Councils in 2006) no longer provides any grant funding to *Searchlight*.

"The allegations that you make are of such a serious nature that I recommend that you take this matter up with the police."

And no doubt Sid will!

The monthly grants that *Searchlight* received, via the London Boroughs Grants Unit, amounted to £21,262, i.e. over a quarter of a million per annum! The monthly breakdown was: Salaries - £11,403; Printing postage and stationery - £2,680; Telephone - £2,500; Hire of equipment - £1,500; Travelling expenses - £2,000; Insurance - £679; Freelance and research costs - £500.

We cannot yet confirm the rumour that Gerry Gable and wife Sonya are to be pensioned off. But we can confirm that London council taxpayers owe a great vote of thanks to Sid Chaney.



Lehman Brothers - another one bites the dust

Credit Crisis Was Waiting To Happen

By the time this issue is published there will be several thousand more City workers losing their jobs in addition to the 4,000 former employees at Lehman Brothers. Whilst we have sympathy for them, particularly those who have not even been paid for their month's work, the media seemed to have less concern for the many thousands who lost their jobs in British industry. As our manufacturing capability was exported

East, we were told that the service industries and the financial sector would provide our future employment and national wealth. How wrong was this forecast.

Like Merrill Lynch, Lehman had a huge exposure to the US mortgage crisis and global debt markets (credit cards debts could be the next disaster zone). Discussing the beginnings of the world credit crisis in this column last April, we showed that in order to maintain the debt system and to keep the whole show on the road, the hedge fund sector of the global capitalists came up with the 'bright' idea of offering mortgages to America's poor - which had full government backing - including millions of immigrants, many of whom would soon lose any worthwhile jobs and thus the

ability to pay off the mortgage. So, as part of the debt-based system, their debts were sold off around the world to various country's equivalents of Northern Rock. Their greed overcame common sense.

In regard to Northern Rock, it is astounding that in early August they were given an additional bail-out of £3.4 billion from the taxpayers. This was mainly raised by converting a chunk of the bank's debt into new shares taken up by the Treasury. Was this action motivated by chance that Northern Rock was previously a financial supporter to the tune of £500,000 of Labour's favourite far left think-tank, the IPPR?

As for an example of greed, we have the case of Crispin Odey who started betting against British banks a year before the first cracks appeared in the global financial system. He is one of the City of London's top hedge fund managers and has made £28 million out of the credit crisis. Since the middle of 2006, his company has been a so-called short seller of struggling Bradford & Bingley and of HBOS, which means it gambled that the price of shares in both companies would fall.

It is opportune to again repeat that although we cannot isolate ourselves completely from the erratic behaviour of the world's money markets, we can at least modify its effects by retaining and regaining British ownership and control of British industry and resources, including financial resources, as well as oil and gas, water and electricity. We must give protection for industry and jobs by selecting tariffs on foreign manufactured goods that we can make competitively ourselves.

Inventiveness and Black History

Several contributors to *Identity* have in recent months explained how the Marxists, having failed to export their Soviet revolution, founded the Frankfurt School in the twenties with the objective of the 'long march through the institutions' to maintain their constant onslaught on western culture. With this in mind, it is easy to see the objective of our Socialist government's education policies, and not least the recent announcement that black history is to be made compulsory in our schools - as it already is in the USA.

Pupils will be taught about the slave trade and the British Empire to "help them understand modern-day issues such as immigration". The two subjects will join the two world wars and the Holocaust as periods that must form part of the history syllabus. The objective here, of course, is that by devious means it will be shown that if you oppose mass immigration into 21st Century Britain, you somehow support the abomination of slavery and also condone the killing of Jews by the Nazis in World War Two. Although children will be taught about the achievements of several minor black people from history, Sir Winston Churchill is now omitted from the list of figures that must be studied. How the history of World War 2 and the British Empire can be taught without mentioning Winston Churchill beggars belief.

Remember the names of those responsible for pushing this



Septimus - as black as the average BNP member

Marxist nonsense through. They are Kevin Brennan, the children's minister, and Mick Waters, the director of curriculum at the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

Primarily because of the pressure on space in this column, I will give just one example of how today's Marxists (no matter what labels they masquerade under) invent an ethnicity for a figure from history in order for the gullible liberal-minded to accept that Africans have contributed much to British and European history and culture. A favourite, particularly with the BBC's children's programmes, is Septimus Severus, who became Roman Emperor in AD 193 and during his visit to Britain was instrumental in having Hadrian's Wall repaired.

Because Septimus Severus was born in Carthage, what is now Tunisia, our children are told he was a "Black Emperor". He even appears on a website entitled "100 Great Black Britons". Wikipedia and other sites all agree that his mother was of Roman descent from an ancient clan and his father came from a distinguished local Berber family. The Berbers lived in North Africa for at least 2,000 years before the arrival of Arabs or any sub-Saharan black Africans and are described as more akin to modern Spaniards, Sicilians or even ancient Egyptians. A glance at the photo of a bust of Septimus Severus that appears on both of the above mentioned websites shows that he is about as black as I am!

Yet the *Daily Telegraph* (hardly a Marxist paper) can publish a letter from Chris McGovern, Director, History Curriculum Association, commenting on the new 'black is beautiful' history curriculum in which he said: "Slavery has been a shared human experience. A dark-skinned African emperor, Septimus Severus, was prominent in enforcing enslavement in Britain at the start of the third century AD."

Sharia Courts Now Active

Despite the Government's earlier assurance that Islamic Sharia courts in Britain (backed by the Archbishop of Canterbury) would only deal with minor disputes amongst Muslim residents, it would appear that this was just appeasement.

Five Islamic law courts have now been operating for more than a year: in London, Birmingham, Bradford, Manchester and Nuneaton. According to Richard Edwards, the *Daily Telegraph* crime correspondent 15.09.08, the Government has actually sanctioned that their rulings are enforceable with the full power of the judicial system, through the county courts or High Court.

Lawyers have issued grave warnings about the dangers of a dual legal system. Our view is that such action must be unlawful, irrespective of whether it is supported by a religious group, for the British law must remain absolute.

Sheikh Faiz-ul-Aqtab Siddiqi, whose Muslim Arbitration Tribunal runs the courts, has tried to get round this by saying that sharia courts were classified as arbitration tribunals under a clause in the Arbitration Act 1996. The rulings of arbitration tribunals are binding in law, provided that both parties in the dispute agree to give it the power to rule on their case.

There are concerns for the rights of women under Islamic law. For example, in an inheritance dispute handled by the Sharia court in Nuneaton, the estate of a Midlands man was divided between three daughters and two sons. The judges gave the sons twice as much as the daughters, in accordance with Sharia. Had the family gone to a British court, the daughters would have got equal amounts.

EU To Control Our Immigration

I am indebted to the BNP website (www.bnp.org.uk) for picking up the latest decision from the EU in Brussels that immigration should no longer be seen as a threat and migration should be regulated at EU level. Yet again it shows how the EU Superstate is determined to take away the rights of its member nations to

operate their own immigration policies.

Significantly, MEPs and their counterparts from the Member States debated these issues at a two-day inter-parliamentary meeting organised jointly with the French National Assembly and Senate. They were split into three working parties (legal immigration, illegal immigration and asylum), with each group delivering its findings to a plenary session.

According to Claudio Fava of Italy, reporting for the working party on legal immigration, "immigration is not a European but a global phenomenon, so the EU must become a global partner, supporting development and democratisation processes" in the south.

French MP Thierry Mariana, reporting for the working party on illegal immigration, explained that Europe must devise "a credible immigration policy while respecting human rights and treating all immigrants with dignity."

For the working party on asylum, Swedish MP Ulf Nilsson reported that "the majority of participants agreed on the need for a common regime" in this field. However, there were differences over how far the EU should go. The first step must be "to respect human dignity and the deadlines laid down by procedures, and guarantee family reunification". In other words, does this mean to encourage these non-Europeans to outbreed us even faster?

We would not argue with the need to respect people's "human rights" or their "human dignity". But there are some immigrants - certainly not all - who do not accord this to the host nations.

Shakespeare's 'Royal Throne' Updated

No doubt I am in good company among many readers who have been uplifted by that particular passage from Shakespeare that starts:


This royal throne of Kings, this sceptred isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise.....

And ends:

This blessed plot, this earth,
This realm, this England.

Robert Farmer, one of our readers writes to say that if Shakespeare were alive today however, he might say something more along the lines of:

This once royal throne of Kings, this septic isle.
No more this earth of majesty,
This now corrupted seat of Mars,
This other Asia, this Paradise lost,
This fortress built by Nature for herself
Against infection and the hand of war,
But now given away by some hapless breed of man,
This little World, This Tarnished stone set in the silver sea,
Which no longer serves it in the office of a Wall,
Nor as a moat defensive to a house,
Against the hordes of immigrants from lands
With a less generous welfare system than our own,
This accursed plot, this sorrowful earth,
This squandered realm, This Engladesh.



The EU's control over Britain tightens

Speakers' Corner

PO Box 97, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 1WT, England. E-mail: identity@bnp.org.uk

LETTER OF THE MONTH

Mass Immigration Causes a Lack of 'Affordable Housing'

Caroline Flint claims that nearly half of the 5,000 new properties in a Ford Eco-Town, if it is built, will be "affordable". We

have heard such promises before, and what is actually delivered still turns out to be beyond the means of most young people on an average wage. In any case, such properties are only ever "affordable", even in name only, once. After the first time they change hands, their new owners naturally sell them, when they move on, at their current market value.

"We have a housing shortage in this country and that's why we need to build more homes," says Ms Flint, clearly one of New Labour's deep thinkers. Yes, Ms Flint, we have a housing shortage - because of your government's "hyping" of demand by encouraging mass immigration over the last 10 years.

While mass immigration continues, there is not a hope that new house-building can keep up with an artificially-stimulated demand.

Furthermore, if immigration were to be halted, as the BNP demands, the country's population would remain stable, if not gradually diminish to the great benefit of everyone's quality of life.

Dr A. Emerson
Chichester BNP

(This letter was published in the Littlehampton Gazette. It was chosen by the editor as Letter of the Month and the author receives a year's subscription to Identity.)

Littlehampton Gazette

However, I don't think it is working very well! A recent report in the *Liverpool Metro* 04.07.08 showed "half of children do not want foreigners living in Britain". (Most of the other half are likely to be immigrants or children of immigrants). The Government's brainwashing attempt through 'citizenship' just may be failing miserably - and with help from the BNP.

Karen Otty
Liverpool

White Cross Memorial



A thank you to all at the RWB who donated to the White Cross Memorial display sponsored by Coventry BNP. The total amount collected in the donation tin was £158.54, plus 2 US cents, 1 US dime and 2 Spanish Euro cents!

The display was well received and gave members and supporters an opportunity to quietly reflect on the tragic waste of life in the name of so-called diversity in Britain today. For those who missed the display, a short video is on You Tube and there are some interesting comments to read, mostly positive.

Mark Badrick
Coventry BNP

EU Propaganda For Our Children



Having read Sharon Knight's letter in the August issue of *Identity*, I believe she is right to be concerned over brainwashing of our children, having trained as a teacher in Religious Education and Citizenship. I am sending you a copy of the DFES Citizenship curriculum.

On the surface it may appear quite benign, but do not think for one second that Citizenship has any desire to foster good British citizens. Its only agenda is to force-feed British children EU propaganda. I have also sent a series of Citizenship textbooks produced for key stage 3 (that is years 7-9 of

high school).

(I have looked through these and they are blatant multicultural and pro-EU propaganda - Editor)

The format is primarily discussion and there isn't any evidence of a specific right or wrong answer (model answer). Marking is based on how well argued the "case" was. (A good example is "Human Rights", check out page 24 scenario 2, where a frequently burgled householder shoots and kills a burglar). To any normal person this is a clear-cut case of self-defence. It does not belong in a court of human rights! Mr Burglar gave up his rights when he illegally entered a property. An English man's home is his castle and he has every right to protect it!

The desired result should be a form of brain washing. The environment created is meant to guide the child to the PC/EU answer and peer pressure will add to this and combining this with the teacher's training should produce a nice little EU clone.

Home Schooling - An Answer

Sharon Knight may be interested to know that the BNP has so many concerns about the national curriculum that a Home Schooling Committee has been set up with the aim of creating a web site to help parents educate their children at home. The committee would appreciate receiving a copy of the letter Sharon wrote to Ed Balls.

We are actively seeking help and advice from BNP parents. If you have educated your child at home, please let us know about it. What web sites have you found helpful? Where did you obtain most of your support? What were your major difficulties?

Boudicca - The British in Revolt

» As part of his occasional series, Eddy Butler looks at another defining event of British history.

The traditional starting point for British History textbooks is 1066 and the Norman Conquest. Some other intrepid souls go back a bit further to the Romans and Julius Caesar's raids on the Kentish coast in 55 and 54 BC. Either way it is as if the dawn of British history has to be seen through a continental lens - from the perspective of invasion from the mainland of Europe - as an invader rather than as an invadée!

This is a major injustice. The Romans were not in the habit of invading and occupying worthless territory. The opposition Caesar's legions met delayed a full scale invasion for nearly another hundred years. Britain already possessed a thriving and rapidly developing Celtic culture with well organised states and an intricate social system.


When the Legions landed again in 43 AD, it was no walk over. It took them decades to subdue the populace and mark out the new Roman domains. Even then all Ireland and most of Scotland escaped subjugation. The Celts obviously felt that their culture was worth fighting for as they resisted ferociously! It is no surprise that the first recorded revolt by the British against foreign invasion and oppression came during this period. This revolt in 61 AD was led by the semi-legendary British heroine, Boadicea or more properly Boudicca. Boudicca, whose name means Victory, was unknown to modern scholars until the early 16th century when the works of the Roman historian Tacitus were re-discovered.

Closely related tribes had been flowing into Britain for thousands of years before the ascent of Rome. The Celts (*or perhaps the culture described as celtic - Ed*) themselves

started to arrive around 800 BC, heralding the dawn of the Iron Age. At the time Britain was intimately linked to North West Europe by blood, language, custom and culture. In about 150 BC, part of a powerful Celtic tribe called the Belgae began migrating here from their homeland (still called Belgium), adding impetus to the development of Britain. A more complex social structure evolved incorporating stone hill forts and market towns. The various tribes began marking out their territories, wheeled transportation flourished and gold and silver coinage came into use. This progress was soon to receive a nasty shock as the Roman eagle was rising over Europe.

Julius Caesar's two largely ineffectual invasions were aimed at chastising the Belgae who had been giving succour to their continental cousins in their struggle against Rome. It was an old Roman tactic to play off one tribe against another. The resistance to Caesar had been led by the Catuvellauni, a tribe from the Hertfordshire area. Rival tribes of the Catuvellauni sided with the Roman enemy. When Caesar withdrew, the Catuvellauni punished these tribes - first by attacking the Trinovantes from Essex, and then the Atrebatas of Sussex. When they were defeated in 40 AD, the Atrebatas asked the Roman Emperor Caligula for help. Across the Channel Britain was still largely an unknown land, regarded with a superstitious dread by the Romans. Furthermore, with the Channel lying as a barrier, if defeated, there could be no retreat to a safe haven.

This then is the background to the final invasion sanctioned in 43 AD by the new Emperor Claudius. This time it was better planned. A British confederacy under the



Catuvellauni was defeated and their leader Caractacus fled to Wales. Wales became the centre of resistance and the last stronghold of the druids, with Anglesey (or Mona) being their main base. The druids were the Celtic priesthood and became the focus of opposition to Rome. In 47 AD the Romans attacked Mona. This sparked off a small revolt in the south east and among the tribes roughly handled in retribution was the Iceni of East Anglia. However, although Caractacus was eventually captured (betrayed by a rival tribe) and shipped off to Rome, the south east revolt diverted Roman strength to the extent that Mona held out.

By 61 AD the druid problem had become a running sore to the Roman occupiers and the new Roman commander Paulinus planned another attack on Mona. The Romans usually avoided tampering with local religious beliefs to avoid causing unnecessary opposition from their subject peoples. There were two notable occasions when the Romans departed from this policy. The first was with the druids. In Britain it took 35 years of bloody warfare to suppress the local priesthood. On the other occasion, in Judaea, the revolt was crushed roughly at the same time as the attack on Mona, in 66 to 73 AD. But the religion they suppressed was not eradicated and there were further revolts throughout the Roman period. It was perhaps easier for

the Jews to survive by dispersing into the surrounding territories and preserving their religion than it was for the druids, isolated as they were on the fringe of Europe, and with the other centre of druidic power, French Gaul, already being rapidly Romanised.

In any case as Paulinus gathered his forces ready to attack Mona, news reached him of a large scale revolt in the south.

THE ICENI AND TRINOVANTES

The causes of this revolt were deep-seated. The main tribes involved were the Iceni and Trinovantes. Despite the minor disturbance in 47 AD, both had been pro-Roman and so had expected, and initially received, preferential treatment. As is always the case when a great power subjugates a country by playing off the tribes against each other, the 'Quislings' always end up suffering just as much in the long term as those that resist.

When the Iceni king Prasutagus died, his two daughters were named as his co-heirs with the Emperor Nero. Instead the Romans claimed the lot and arrogantly plundered the land. When Prasutagus's widow Boudicca objected, she was stripped and whipped while her daughters were raped. At the same time the Trinovantes had been insulted by the Romans using their capital Camulodunum (Colchester) as

a colony, with Roman veteran soldiers settling there. This is perhaps the first example of alien immigration and settlement in Britain (as opposed to the migration of related tribes) and there was quite a reaction to it.

To compound the insult, not only was their capital being swamped with foreign settlers, but a massive temple was built dedicated to Claudius, the conqueror of Britain. The Trinovantes even had to pay for the building of the temple (symbolising their religious oppression) by taxation. By 61 AD these humiliations made it easy for the druids to raise the Iceni and the Trinovantes in open revolt.

As trouble flared up, the superstitious colonists in Camulodunum were panic stricken. A number of portents seemed to signal an impending disaster. The sea was said to have turned the colour of blood while the ebb tide left heaps of seaweed on the shore that resembled human bodies. Sure enough, when Boudicca led her irate tribesmen down, the Roman immigrants were exterminated and the city systematically destroyed. The Britons followed up this success by virtually annihilating a relieving force of 2,000 Romans from the IXth Legion.

Paulinus realised he could not stop the revolt in the south and abandoned Londinium, the new thriving and sprawling trading settlement on the banks of the River Thames, to its fate. Boudicca's host descended on what was little more than a shanty town, and completely destroyed it with fire and the sword. This was the first great fire of London and to this day whenever a new building is built in the City a distinctive red burn layer can be seen in the soil. In the words of Tacitus "All those left behind were butchered. The British took no prisoners, nor did they consider the money



they could get for selling slaves; it was the gibbet, fire and the cross."

Captives were sacrificed to the goddess Andrasta (the unconquerable). Both men and women were hideously tortured. Shortly afterwards Verulamium (St Albans), the capital of the Catuvellauni was also destroyed. This was a deliberate act of vengeance against the Catuvellauni who had ironically by now become the most Romanised of all the British tribes and had refused to join the revolt. They suffered accordingly.

DEGENERATE MOB

The three biggest settlements in Roman Britain had been wiped out and upwards of 80,000 people had been slain. But the Britons now lost vital time in looting. Their success had gone to their heads. From being a fine military force, of individualistic but fine swordsmen, the British army degenerated into being about as effective as a mob of football hooligans. This was due to hangers on, faint hearts and scum swelling the ranks after the initial victories. They did more harm than good. Paulinus did not waste any time. He pulled back from Mona and concentrated his forces in the Midlands. Despite the losses already suffered he had maybe as many as 13,000 crack Legionaries at his disposal.

Eventually Boudicca's host marched north to confront him. Roman sources claim the British army numbered 230,000 men, but this is a ridiculously high figure. It would be impossible to feed such a large number for any length of time. The largest recorded battle on domestic soil for which we have reliable numbers was in Towton in Yorkshire during the Wars of the Roses in 1462. This unprecedented battle involved around 80,000 combatants and was particularly bloody, with perhaps 35,000 casualties. These figures should be borne in mind when reading the inflated figures given by Roman historians. When they quoted a large number it really only means 'there were loads of them'. All we can say with certainty is that Boudicca's host definitely well outnumbered Paulinus' army, but that the British force included many who were more of a hindrance than a help.

No one knows where the final battle took place. It was believed to be somewhere along Watling Street, the Roman road that stretched from London to the north west, probably in the vicinity of Coventry.

Using his poetic license to the full, Tacitus had the opposing commanders start the proceedings with stirring speeches. Boudicca's finale was: "Nothing is safe from Roman pride and arrogance. They will deface the sacred and will deflower our virgins. Win the battle or perish. This is my resolve as a woman - follow me or submit to the Roman yoke."

Paulinus' oration was more business-like: "Ignore the racket made by these

savages. There are more women than men in their ranks. They are not soldiers - they're not even properly equipped. We've beaten them before and when they see our weapons and feel our spirit, they'll crack. Stick together. Throw the javelins, then push forward: knock them down with your shields and finish them off with your swords. Forget about booty. Just win and you'll have the lot."

Then battle was joined. The Romans had chosen their ground well to nullify the British advantage in numbers. They defended a narrow front protected by a natural ditch or gorge with forests on either side limiting the scope for a flank attack. When the Britons charged they could not effectively use their best weapon, the Celtic long sword, in the crush. The Romans met the charge with two volleys of javelins and counter attacked in wedge formation. The Britons were impeded from advancing by their own dead and from retreating by their own baggage train and multitude of camp followers. Great slaughter resulted. The disciplined legions of Rome triumphed. According to Tacitus 80,000 Britons perished against only 400 Romans. As noted these are hardly credible figures, but then the victors are the ones who write history! Coincidentally Tacitus's 80,000 British neatly balances the 80,000 Romans slaughtered in the revolt. *Quid pro quo!*

Nevertheless, Boudicca's revolt was over at a stroke and she committed suicide. The Romans sacrificed their prisoners to Mars Ultor, the god of vengeance. But this was a severe shock to Rome. As an indicator of her true military losses, 7,000 reinforcements were sent immediately.



From then on the permanent Roman garrison of Britain was 50,000 men. This was a massive military commitment to hold a province populated by a few million subjects. It is more than the number of European soldiers that we used to station in India to hold down a population numbering hundreds of millions. Further Roman expansion into Britain ceased for twelve years and Mona held out until 78 AD. From then on Rome adopted the policy of reconciliation rather than repression.

The British warriors, true to their blood, were superb individual fighters. When they fought with discipline and on their own terms, they were more than a match for the Legions of Rome. The rebellion only failed when the original army's ranks were swelled by undisciplined hangers-on. The Romans were eased in their task by petty jealousies and divisions between the tribes. If there had been more unity, the Romans may have been flung back across the channel. The main unifying force in Britain was the druids. They were staunch defenders of the Celtic culture. The Romans saw that to undermine resistance to their rule they first had to undermine native culture. In France, for example, they were completely successful and the Celtic Gauls became totally Romanised. In Britain the Romans were never so successful. When they eventually withdrew from Britain 400 years later, under attack from the Angles and Saxons, the native Britons still spoke their Celtic tongue, as is seen by the modern day survival of Welsh (Cymraeg) and Cornish (Kernowek).

Above all the story of Boudicca's revolt portrays the long-standing fighting spirit of our nations. It shows that Britons do not meekly submit to being a nation of slaves.

NEW**£11 inc p&p**

Not Just About the Music is the stunning new album from Joey Smith - the fastest rising star in the nationalist music scene. It contains 11 original tracks, performed and recorded in GWR's own studio.

Please make cheques payable to 'Great White Records': PO Box 74, Market Weighton, East Yorkshire, YO43 4WT or order online!

GREAT WHITE

www.greatwhiterecords.com**Order Hotline: 0871 050 0242****£11 inc p&p**

West Wind is the best selling album from Great White Records. It contains 11 tracks written by Nick Griffin and arranged and performed by a variety of nationalist artists. This album really is a must have in anyone's collection.

You don't have to send a cheque; you can also order both of these albums by telephone on our new hotline **0871 050 0242** or order online!

The Dilemma of Islam in Britain

» Dr Abu-Nabeel is an Iraqi Christian now living in the UK. His experiences of the dilemma arising from the division amongst Muslims are of interest to those of us who are trying to limit the growing power of Islam in Britain and Europe.



In the last 25 years the Muslim population in the UK has reached 1.7 million (2006) with 1,400 mosques and counting. It was inevitable that along with this increase there would be a rise in problems across the country, such as the Hijab/Nikab issue, honour killings and terrorism. Following the terrorist attacks which occurred in London and at Glasgow airport, questions were asked by many: How can a highly qualified Muslim doctor, who took an oath to cure sick people, suddenly accept the act of killing and be a killer himself? How does a devout Muslim who reads The Holy Quran, praying five times a day, commit such a heinous crime?

To attempt an answer to such difficult questions, the following facts about Islam and Muslims should be noted. Islam is based on the Holy Quran, Hadeeth and Sunna (teachings and directives of the prophet).

Translation

The Holy Quran is made up of 114 Sura (chapters). Of these, 86 were revealed to the prophet in Mecca between 610-622 AD and 28 Sura were revealed to the prophet in Medina between 622-632 AD. The official language of Islam is Arabic and it is a sin and blasphemy to translate the Holy Quran to any other language. A major verse says "reveal the Arabic Quran so you gain wisdom." In the early years religious leaders of non-Arabic speaking nations learned the Arabic language in order to understand the Holy Quran. Today, however, to overcome this difficulty, the Holy Quran is interpreted (as opposed to being translated) in many languages.

Violence

The first 86 Sura represent the beginning of Islam when the prophet began teaching and preaching in order to gain supporters and faithfuls from among the locals. During this phase the prophet was mild, diplomatic and genuinely caring. He was helped by the Jews and Christians in Mecca in teaching about the one God.

A famous verse from this period (often quoted by the Muslim Council of the UK) is: "No compulsion in religion" (Sura 2 verse 256). Many other 'peaceful' verses were preached during this period (610-622 AD). As a direct result of these teachings, the number of followers increased to the point that it became a threat to the wealthy upper class merchants. Several attempts to assassinate the prophet failed. He then moved to Medina in 622

AD. Here many powerful tribes embraced Islam.

Whilst in Medina, the attitude of the prophet appears to have changed as violence begins to appear in the revelations such as: "Kill the opponent" (2. 191). In reference to the Jews and Christians, the new message was: "Fight and kill the people of the book" (2.29). According to one estimate (<http://www.fatherzakaria.net/>) there are more than 30,000 verses in the Holy Quran, Hadeeth and Sunna that promote violence.

The Dilemma

From my personal experience as an Iraqi, Muslims can be divided into those that follow teachings revealed in Mecca or from the teachings revealed in Medina. A true devout Muslim is one who follows the teaching of the Holy Quran, Hadeeth and Sunna of the prophet, prays five times a day and where possible follows the Sharia Law.

It is here where the dilemma stares us in the face. The Muslim Council of the UK preaches the Mecca part of the Holy Quran in order to spread Islam, with Saudi financial backing enabling the building of mosques, schools and Islamic missionary centres. If the grand mosque planned for London is built it will be the point of no return, in the same manner as that achieved by Islam over a thousand years ago when the Al-Azhar centre was built in Cairo. As a result, the Christian country of Egypt was converted to Islam by the sword. It should be noted that the doctors involved in the failed attacks in London and Glasgow airport follow the Medina Holy Quran, which recommends that you use force to terrorise your enemy when you can.

The Muslims following the 86 Sura of the Mecca Holy Quran try to distance themselves from terrorism committed by true and devout Muslims. On the other hand the true and devout Muslims following the Medina Quran state the fact that the violent verses of the Medina Holy Quran overcome the peaceful verses of the Mecca Holy Quran. For example, even today if a Muslim leaves Islam he must be killed (2.256). No compulsion in religion has been deleted by 2.191. It remains clear: kill whoever rejects Islam.

The interpretation of the Holy Quran also creates a number of problems. For example, in my Arabic Holy Quran a verse says *Irhibou Aada'akum*, which means "terrorise your enemy." In my English version it says "frighten your enemy." There is an important difference between "terrorise" and "frighten." Therefore, the true devout Muslims are those who go deep into the Holy Quran of Medina, the violent Hadeeth and the Sunna.

Today a second group of Muslims are struggling to distance themselves from the violence and terror; these are the secular humanist, the communist and the indifferent. They are Muslims because they were brought up in a Muslim family. In the main they live and let live, are easygoing and respect other non-Muslims. These people may be called moderate Muslims (religiously if not politically) but are considered as infidels and enemies of true Islam by their extreme counterparts.

The Dilemma of 9/11

Finally, many Muslims felt let down and tried to distance themselves from the massacre of 9/11 in the USA. Yet on the other hand many Muslim organisations and Muslim individuals regard those who committed the heinous crimes as martyrs who have gone to paradise to enjoy good wine and the many beautiful virgins as stated in the Holy Quran. I was hoping that the massacre of 7/7 on the London underground would have been the wake-up call for the British government to re-think and come up with a new strategy to deal with the crisis, but alas it remains oblivious to this threat. Again, would the failed attack in London and Glasgow airport be the last wake-up call? We should remind ourselves that the dangerous situation facing Christianity in Muslim countries such as Egypt, Iraq, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and the rest is one continuous process following the teaching of the Medina part of the Holy Quran. In Iraq today the Christians are given three options:

1. Convert to Islam
2. Leave the country
3. Pay the Juzzia (a poll tax on Christians)

Saudi Arabia is funding the construction and building of the majority of mosques in Christian countries such as Europe, Australia, USA and Canada. However, there is no sign of a single church in Saudi Arabia, despite the fact that there are thousands of Christians working there. Why not? Because the prophet ordered that the Land of Islam must be cleansed from the infidels (Jews and Christians).

Weed Out the Perpetrators

Over a thousand years ago Islam invaded the Christian country of Egypt, massacred thousands and put Egypt under its sword. The terrorist doctors and London underground bombers were following in the footsteps of their ancestors. I am sure the British people will pull together and weed out the perpetrators and those who support terrorism financially. The irony and hypocrisy is the fact that the Saudi Arabian government is spreading Islam by the Petrol Dollar and enabling Saudi dissidents to spread Islam by its financial support.

If anybody is in doubt that violence and terrorism are promoted in the Medina Quran, they should make an effort to read it. English language copies are available in the libraries, Islamic centres, mosques and the Saudi Embassy in London. Other sources can be obtained from the many Islamic sites on the internet.

I am forced to conclude that the 28 Sura revealed in Medina 622-632 AD are a basic textbook for terrorism and hope that some human rights organisation may take a stand and challenge the 28 Sura of Medina in Court. May our Lord protect this great country from any foreign terrorism.



Donate By Credit or Debit Card - Call 0871 050 0234



Help Build Our Alternative Media

The BNP is leading the way with its new live online BNPTv broadcasts. On Sunday July 28th the channel took a huge leap forward with a speech from Party Chairman Nick Griffin which was broadcast live from a meeting in Cornwall.

We are working toward launching a BNPTv channel running 24 hours a day with news, views, commentary and live speeches from party officers. Help us build this exciting new experience - help us bypass the liberal left media and take our message straight to the masses.

Yes, I want to help the BNPTv with its groundbreaking new internet TV channel and would like to donate toward the cost of new equipment to keep us ahead of the pack:

☐ £10

☐ £25

☐ £1000

☐ £50

☐ £100

☐ Other:

Name:

Address:

Please send to: The Secretary, PO Box 142, Leeds, LS8 9DR

Please send an SAE if you require an acknowledgement for sums of £25 or less

Subscribe To Identity

The following rates are for 6 or 12 issues respectively (please tick box as applicable):

British Isles £17.50 ☐ £35 ☐

Overseas air mail Europe £23.20 ☐ £46.40 ☐

Overseas air mail Middle East, North and South America £26.90 ☐ £53.70 ☐

Overseas air mail Australasia, Far East £26.90 ☐ £53.70 ☐

Please Note: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling. If you are paying in any other currency, an additional charge of £4.50 is required with cheques and money orders and £2.50 with banknotes.

Name

Address

Postcode

Telephone

E-mail

All cheques etc should be made payable to 'British National Party' or 'British Heritage' and sent to: PO Box 17, Amlwch, LL68 8AB. You can subscribe online at www.bnp.org.uk. Photocopies can be used.

Identity Bulk Order Rates

5 - £9.25; 10 - £17; 15 - £24; 20 - £31; 25 - £38; 30 - £44; 40 - £58; 50 - £71; 60 - £84; 80 - £110; 100 - £135

Postage - £2.15 for 5; £3.90 for 10; £7.75 for 15 - 25; £8.80 for 30 - 40; £10.00 for 50; £10.80 for 60; £12.55 for 80-100